

You don't really distinguish between a film (more likely a video nowadays) as a free-standing object of art and a film as part of the documentation accompanying an ethnographic study. In a film-making program you could and would get credit for the first case. But to get acknowledgement for a project being based in ethnographic research, wouldn't you really need to demonstrate that the research and analysis phase came up to the expectations of the discipline (anthro or sociology, I imagine) in order to support the filmic presentation of the analysis?

As Professor Jackson knows, there are academic journals that cover visual ethnography, such as *Visual Anthropology*, and there's a small but distinguished set of books on the subject ranging from a classic such as Sol Worth and John Adair's *Through Navaho Eyes* to Catherine Russell's recent *Experimental Ethnography*. And anthropology has a heightened awareness of analyzing the visual part of culture as evidenced in books such as Faye Ginsburg, Lila Abu-Lughod, and Brian Larkin, eds. *Media Worlds: Anthropology on New Terrain*. Ethnographic film has been regularly featured and discussed at important international events such as the Visible Evidence documentary conferences over the past 20 years. So there is an often lively discussion of ethnographic moving image creations.

While there is a noticeable bias among many academics and intellectuals against the visual, as opposed to the verbal, in terms of analysis and presentation of analysis (or we wouldn't have to sit through so many miserable hours of visually primitive PowerPoint presentations!), some of the skepticism must be honestly due to a history of presenting poetic myths as ethnography: ranging from Flaherty's *Nanook of the North* to Robert Gardner's *Forest of Bliss*. That these are sometimes taken as science rather than neocolonial fantasies, does damage the field as a whole.

Chuck Kleinhans

